

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/724,058		PARK ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Antonio A. Caschera		2676	

All Participants:

(1) Antonio A. Caschera.

(2) Michael Kondoudis.

Date of Interview: 5 & 6 October 2005

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
N/A

Claims discussed:
5, 9 and 10

Prior art documents discussed:
N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.


☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: Responding to Amendment filed 07/29/05

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 3PM


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner contacted Applicant's Representative to authorize Examiner's Amendment for correcting minor informalities in the claims in particular, correcting for antecedent basis in claim 5 ("the cumulative distribution function calculator"), correcting for antecedent basis in claim 9 ("the...third upper value limits and the...third lower value limits") and canceling claim 10 since the limitations of claim 10 were already amended into claim 9, from which claim 10 depends upon. In reference to claim 5, claim 5's dependency was changed so that it now depends upon claim 4 which corrects the lack of antecedent basis. In reference to claim 9, the words, "a third" and "third" were inserted into the "setting an upper limit value..." limitation to further define the limits as "third" upper and lower limits. Applicant's Representative agreed to the changes and authorized Examiner to perform an Examiner's Amendment.